arXiv:1012.5349v2 [math.AP] 25 Mar 2011

On the Cauchy problem of a periodic 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system

Jingjing Liu[*]
Department of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University,
510275 Guangzhou, China

Zhaoyang Yin[†]
Department of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University,
510275 Guangzhou, China

Abstract

In this paper, we study the Cauchy problem of a periodic 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system. We first establish the local well-posedness for the periodic 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system by Kato's semigroup theory. Then, we derive the precise blow-up scenario for strong solutions to the system. Moreover, we present some blow-up results for strong solutions to the system. Finally, we give a global existence result to the system.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35G25, 35L05

Keywords: A periodic 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system, blow-up scenario, blow-up, strong solutions, global existence.

1 Introduction

Recently, a new 2-component system was introduced by Zuo in [23] as follows:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\mu(u)_t - u_{txx} = 2\mu(u)u_x - 2u_x u_{xx} - u u_{xxx} + \rho\rho_x & -\gamma_1 u_{xxx}, \\
 & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\
\rho_t = (\rho u)_x + 2\gamma_2 \rho_x, & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\
u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\
\rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\
u(t,x+1) = u(t,x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \\
\rho(t,x+1) = \rho(t,x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R},
\end{array}\right. \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mu(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}} u dx$ with $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$. By integrating both sides of the first equation in the system (1.1) over the circle $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and using the periodicity of u, one obtain

$$\mu(u_t) = \mu(u)_t = 0.$$

---

[*] e-mail: jingjing830306@163.com
[†] e-mail: mcsyzy@mail.sysu.edu.cn

This yields the following periodic 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system:

$$\begin{cases} -u_{txx} = 2\mu(u)u_x - 2u_xu_{xx} - uu_{xxx} + \rho\rho_x & -\gamma_1 u_{xxx}, \\ & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho_t = (\rho u)_x + 2\gamma_2\rho_x, & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(t,x+1) = u(t,x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(t,x+1) = \rho(t,x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

with $\gamma_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, 2$. This system is a 2-component generalization of the generalized Hunter-Saxton equation obtained in [16]. The author [23] shows that this system is both a bihamiltonian Euler equation and a bivariational equation.

Obviously, (1.1) is equivalent to (1.2) under the condition $\mu(u_t) = \mu(u)_t = 0$. In this paper, we will study the system (1.2) under the assumption $\mu(u_t) = \mu(u)_t = 0$.

For $\rho \equiv 0$ and $\gamma = 0$, and replacing t by $-t$, the system (1.2) reduces to the generalized Hunter-Saxton equation (named μ-Hunter-Saxton equation or μ-Camassa-Holm equation) as follows:

$$-u_{txx} = -2\mu(u)u_x + 2u_xu_{xx} + uu_{xxx}, \tag{1.3}$$

which is obtained and studied in [16]. Moreover, the periodic μ-Hunter-Saxton equation and the periodic μ-Degasperis-Procesi equation have also been studied in [10, 17] recently. It is worthy to note that the μ-Hunter-Saxton equation has a very closed relation with the periodic Hunter-Saxton and Camassa-Holm equations. For $\mu(u) = 0$, the equation (1.3) reduces to the Hunter-Saxton equation [11]

$$u_{txx} + 2u_xu_{xx} + uu_{xxx} = 0, \tag{1.4}$$

modeling the propagation of weakly nonlinear orientation waves in a massive nematic liquid crystal. Here, $u(t,x)$ describes the director field of a nematic liquid crystal, x is the space variable in a reference frame moving with the linearized wave velocity, t is a slow time variable. The orientation of the molecules is described by the field of unit vectors $(\cos u(t,x), \sin u(t,x))$ [22]. The single-component model also arises in a different physical context as the high-frequency limit [7, 12] of the Camassa-Holm equation, which is a model for shallow water waves [2, 13] and a re-expression of the geodesic flow on the diffeomorphism group of the circle [5] with a bi-Hamiltonian structure [9] which is completely integrable [6]. The Hunter-Saxton equation also has a bi-Hamiltonian structure [13, 19] and is completely integrable [1, 12]. The initial value problem for the Hunter-Saxton equation (1.4) on the line (nonperiodic case) and on the unit circle $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ were studied by Hunter and Saxton in [11] using the method of characteristics and by Yin in [22] using Kato semigroup method, respectively.

For $\rho \not\equiv 0$, $\gamma_i = 0, i = 1, 2$ $\mu(u) = 0$ and replacing t by $-t$, peakon solutions of the Cauchy problem of the system (1.2) have been analysed in [4]. Moreover, the Cauchy problem of 2-component periodic Hunter-Saxton system has been discussed in [18, 20]. However, the Cauchy problem of the system (1.2) has not been studied yet. The aim of this paper is to establish the local well-posedness for the system (1.2), to derive the precise blow-up scenario, to prove that the system (1.2) has global strong solutions and also finite time blow-up solutions.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we establish the local well-posedness of the initial value problem associated with the system (1.2). In Section 3, we derive the precise blow-up scenario. In Section 4, we present two explosion criteria of strong solutions to the system (1.2) with general initial data. In Section 5, we give a new global existence result of strong solutions to the system (1.2).

Notation Given a Banach space Z, we denote its norm by $\|\cdot\|_Z$. Since all space of functions are over $\mathbb{S} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, for simplicity, we drop $\mathbb{S}$ in our notations if there is no ambiguity. We let $[A, B]$ denote the commutator of linear operator A and B. For convenience, we let $(\cdot|\cdot)_{s\times r}$ and $(\cdot|\cdot)_s$ denote the inner products of $H^s \times H^r$, $s, r \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and H^s, $s \in \mathbb{R}_+$, respectively.

2 Local well-posedness

In this section, we will establish the local well-posedness for the Cauchy problem of the system (1.2) in $H^s \times H^{s-1}$, $s \geq 2$, by applying Kato's theory [14].

The condition $\mu(u_t) = 0$ ensures that the first equation in (1.2) can be recast in the form

$$u_t - (u + \gamma_1)u_x = \partial_x(\mu - \partial_x^2)^{-1}(2\mu u + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho^2),$$

where $A = \mu - \partial_x^2$ is an isomorphism between H^s and H^{s-2}. Using this identity, the system (1.2) takes the form of a quasi-linear evolution equation of hyperbolic type:

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (u + \gamma_1)u_x = \partial_x(\mu - \partial_x^2)^{-1} & (2\mu u + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho^2), \\ & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho_t - (u + 2\gamma_2)\rho_x = u_x\rho, & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0, x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(0, x) = \rho_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(t, x + 1) = \rho(t, x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(t, x + 1) = u(t, x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

Let $z := \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$, $A(z) = \begin{pmatrix} -(u + \gamma_1)\partial_x & 0 \\ 0 & -(u + 2\gamma_2)\partial_x \end{pmatrix}$ and

$$f(z) = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_x(\mu - \partial_x^2)^{-1}(2\mu u + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + \frac{1}{2}\rho^2) \\ u_x\rho \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set $Y = H^s \times H^{s-1}$, $X = H^{s-1} \times H^{s-2}$, $\Lambda = (\mu - \partial_x^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $Q = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda \end{pmatrix}$. Obviously, Q is an isomorphism of $H^s \times H^{s-1}$ onto $H^{s-1} \times H^{s-2}$.

Similar to the proof of Theorem 2.2 in [8], we get the following conclusion.

Theorem 2.1 *Given $z_0 = (u_0, \rho_0) \in H^s \times H^{s-1}$, $s \geq 2$, then there exists a maximal $T = T(\| z_0 \|_{H^s\times H^{s-1}}) > 0$, and a unique solution $z = (u, \rho)$ to (2.1) such that*

$$z = z(\cdot, z_0) \in C([0, T); H^s \times H^{s-1}) \cap C^1([0, T); H^{s-1} \times H^{s-2}).$$

Moreover, the solution depends continuously on the initial data, i.e., the mapping

$$z_0 \to z(\cdot, z_0) : H^s \times H^{s-1} \to C([0, T); H^s \times H^{s-1}) \cap C^1([0, T); H^{s-1} \times H^{s-2})$$

is continuous.

Recall that the periodic 2-component Hunter-Saxton system discussed in [18] only has local existence but not local well-posedness because of the lack of uniqueness. The ambiguity disappears in the case of the periodic 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system from the Theorem 2.1. This is a very important difference between the 2-component Hunter-Saxton system and the 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton system.

Consequently, we will give another equivalent form of (1.2). Integrating both sides of the first equation in (1.2) with respect to x, we obtain

$$u_{tx} = -2\mu(u)u + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + uu_{xx} - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + \gamma_1 u_{xx} + a(t),$$

where

$$a(t) = 2\mu(u)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u_x^2 + \rho^2)dx.$$

Using the system (1.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u_x^2 + \rho^2)dx \qquad (2.2)\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u_x u_{xt} + \rho\rho_t)dx\\
=&-\int_{\mathbb{S}}uu_{txx}dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}}\rho\rho_t dx\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{S}}2\mu(u)uu_x dx - 2\int_{\mathbb{S}}uu_x u_{xx}dx - \int_{\mathbb{S}}u^2 u_{xxx}dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}}u\rho_x\rho dx\\
&-\gamma_1\int_{\mathbb{S}}uu_{xxx}dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}}\rho(u\rho)_x dx + 2\gamma_2\int_{\mathbb{S}}\rho\rho_x dx\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{S}}u\rho_x\rho dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}}\rho(u\rho)_x dx = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By $\mu(u)_t = \mu(u_t) = 0$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}a(t) = 0.$$

For convenience, we let

$$\mu_0 := \mu(u_0) = \mu(u) = \int_{\mathbb{S}}u(t,x)dx,$$

$$\mu_1 := \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u_x^2 + \rho^2)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u_{0,x}^2 + \rho_0^2)dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and write $a := a(0)$ henceforth. Thus,

$$u_{tx} = -2\mu_0 u + \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 + uu_{xx} - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + \gamma_1 u_{xx} + a \qquad (2.3)$$

is a valid reformulation of the first equation in (1.2). Integrating (2.3) with respect to x, we get

$$u_t - (u + \gamma_1)u_x = \partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a) + h(t),$$

where $\partial_x^{-1}g(x) = \int_0^x g(y)dy$ and $h(t) : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function. For the 2-component Hunter-Saxton system, if we follow the above same procedure, then the arbitrariness of continuous function $h(t)$ will lead to the non-uniqueness of solution to (1.2). In this paper, the condition $\mu(u_t) = 0$ implies that $h(t)$ is unique. Consequently, the solution to (1.2) will be unique.

Thus we get another equivalent form of (1.2)

$$\begin{cases} u_t - (u+\gamma_1)u_x = \partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 & \\ -\frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a) + h(t), & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho_t - (u + 2\gamma_2)\rho_x = u_x\rho, & t > 0,\ x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(0,x) = u_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(0,x) = \rho_0(x), & x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ u(t,x+1) = u(t,x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \\ \rho(t,x+1) = \rho(t,x), & t \geq 0, x \in \mathbb{R}, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

where $\partial_x^{-1}g(x) = \int_0^x g(y)dy$ and $h(t) : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function.

3 The precise blow-up scenario

In this section, we present the precise blow-up scenario for strong solutions to the system (1.2).

We first recall the following lemmas.

Lemma 3.1 *[15] If* $r > 0$*, then* $H^r \cap L^\infty$ *is an algebra. Moreover*

$$\| fg \|_{H^r} \leq c(\| f \|_{L^\infty} \| g \|_{H^r} + \| f \|_{H^r} \| g \|_{L^\infty}),$$

where c *is a constant depending only on* r*.*

Lemma 3.2 *[15] If* $r > 0$*, then*

$$\| [\Lambda^r, f]g \|_{L^2} \leq c(\| \partial_x f \|_{L^\infty} \| \Lambda^{r-1} g \|_{L^2} + \| \Lambda^r f \|_{L^2} \| g \|_{L^\infty}),$$

where c *is a constant depending only on* r*.*

Next we prove the following useful result on global existence of solutions to (1.2).

Theorem 3.1 *Let* $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^s \times H^{s-1},\ s \geq 2,$ *be given and assume that* T *is the maximal existence time of the corresponding solution* $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ *to (2.4) with the initial data* z_0*. If there exists* $M > 0$ *such that*

$$\|u_x(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho_x(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq M, \quad t \in [0,T),$$

then the $H^s \times H^{s-1}$*-norm of* $z(t,\cdot)$ *does not blow up on [0,T).*

Proof Let $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ be the solution to (2.4) with the initial data $z_0 \in H^s \times H^{s-1},\ s \geq 2,$ and let T be the maximal existence time of the corresponding solution z, which is guaranteed by Theorem 2.1. Throughout this proof, $c > 0$ stands for a generic constant depending only on s.

Applying the operator Λ^s to the first equation in (2.4), multiplying by $\Lambda^s u$, and integrating over $\mathbb{S}$, we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u\|_{H^s}^2 = 2(uu_x, u)_s + 2(u, \partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a) + h(t))_s. \tag{3.1}$$

Let us estimate the first term of the right-hand side of (3.1).

$$\begin{aligned} |(uu_x, u)_s| &= |(\Lambda^s(u\partial_x u), \Lambda^s u)_0| \\ &= |([\Lambda^s, u]\partial_x u, \Lambda^s u)_0 + (u\Lambda^s\partial_x u, \Lambda^s u)_0| \\ &\le \|[\Lambda^s, u]\partial_x u\|_{L^2}\|\Lambda^s u\|_{L^2} + \frac{1}{2}|(u_x\Lambda^s u, \Lambda^s u)_0| \\ &\le (c\|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + \frac{1}{2}\|u_x\|_{L^\infty})\|u\|_{H^s}^2 \\ &\le c\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{H^s}^2, \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where we used Lemma 3.2 with $r = s$. Let $f \in H^{s-1}, s \ge 2$. We have

$$|\partial_x^{-1}f| = |\int_0^x f dx| \le \int_{\mathbb{S}} |f|dx \le \|f\|_{L^2}$$

and

$$\|\partial_x^{-1}f\|_{L^2} = \left(\int_0^1 (\partial_x^{-1}f)^2 dx\right)^{1/2} \le \left(\int_0^1 \|f\|_{L^2}^2 dx\right)^{1/2} = \|f\|_{L^2}.$$

Thus

$$\|\partial_x^{-1}f\|_{H^s} \le \|\partial_x^{-1}f\|_{L^2} + \|f\|_{H^{s-1}} \le 2\|f\|_{H^{s-1}}.$$

Then, we estimate the second term of the right-hand side of (3.1) in the following way:

$$\begin{aligned} &|(\partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a) + h(t), u)_s| \\ &\le \|\partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a) + h(t)\|_{H^s}\|u\|_{H^s} \\ &\le (\|\partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a)\|_{H^s} + \|h(t)\|_{H^s})\|u\|_{H^s} \\ &\le (2\| - 2\mu_0 u - \frac{1}{2}u_x^2 - \frac{1}{2}\rho^2 + a\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|h(t)\|_{H^s})\|u\|_{H^s} \\ &\le (4|\mu_0|\|u\|_{H^s} + \|u_x^2\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\rho^2\|_{H^{s-1}} + 2\|a\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|h(t)\|_{H^s})\|u\|_{H^s} \\ &\le c(\|u\|_{H^s} + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|u_x\|_{H^{s-1}} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}} + |a| + \max_{t\in[0,T)}|h(t)|)\|u\|_{H^s} \\ &\le c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} + 1)(\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + 1), \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where we used Lemma 3.1 with $r = s - 1$. Combining (3.2) and (3.3) with (3.1), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|u\|_{H^s}^2 \le c(\|\rho\|_{L^\infty} + \|u_x\|_{L^\infty} + 1)(\|u\|_{H^s}^2 + \|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 + 1). \tag{3.4}$$

In order to derive a similar estimate for the second component ρ, we apply the operator Λ^{s-1} to the second equation in (2.4), multiply by $\Lambda^{s-1}\rho$, and integrate over $\mathbb{S}$, to obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}^2 = 2(u\rho_x, \rho)_{s-1} + 2(u_x\rho, \rho)_{s-1}. \tag{3.5}$$

Let us estimate the first term of the right hand side of (3.5)

$$\begin{aligned}&|(u\rho_x,\rho)_{s-1}|\\ &=|(\Lambda^{s-1}(u\partial_x\rho),\Lambda^{s-1}\rho)_0|\\ &=|([\Lambda^{s-1},u]\partial_x\rho,\Lambda^{s-1}\rho)_0+(u\Lambda^{s-1}\partial_x\rho,\Lambda^{s-1}\rho)_0|\\ &\leq \|[\Lambda^{s-1},u]\partial_x\rho\|_{L^2}\|\Lambda^{s-1}\rho\|_{L^2}+\frac{1}{2}|(u_x\Lambda^{s-1}\rho,\Lambda^{s-1}\rho)_0|\\ &\leq c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}\|u\|_{H^{s-1}})\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}+\frac{1}{2}\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}\\ &\leq c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty})(\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+\|u\|^2_{H^s}),\end{aligned}$$

here we applied Lemma 3.2 with $r=s-1$. Then we estimate the second term of the right hand side of (3.5). Based on Lemma 3.1 with $r=s-1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}|(u_x\rho,\rho)_{s-1}|&\leq \|u_x\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}\\ &\leq c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}+\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\|u_x\|_{H^{s-1}})\|\rho\|_{H^{s-1}}\\ &\leq c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty})(\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+\|u\|^2_{H^s}).\end{aligned}$$

Combining the above two inequalities with (3.5), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}\leq c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty})(\|u\|^2_{H^s}+\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+1). \tag{3.6}$$

By (3.4) and (3.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}(\|u\|^2_{H^s}+\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+1)\\ &\leq c(\|u_x\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}+\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}+1)(\|u\|^2_{H^s}+\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+1).\end{aligned}$$

An application of Gronwall's inequality and the assumption of the theorem yield

$$(\|u\|^2_{H^s}+\|\rho\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+1)\leq \exp(c(M+1)t)(\|u_0\|^2_{H^s}+\|\rho_0\|^2_{H^{s-1}}+1).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem.

Given $z_0\in H^s\times H^{s-1}$ with $s\geq 2$. Theorem 2.1 ensures the existence of a maximal $T>0$ and a solution $z=\begin{pmatrix}u\\ \rho\end{pmatrix}$ to (2.4) such that

$$z=z(\cdot,z_0)\in C([0,T);H^s\times H^{s-1})\cap C^1([0,T);H^{s-1}\times H^{s-2}).$$

Consider now the following initial value problem

$$\begin{cases}q_t=u(t,-q)+2\gamma_2, & t\in[0,T),\\ q(0,x)=x, & x\in\mathbb{R},\end{cases} \tag{3.7}$$

where u denotes the first component of the solution z to (2.4). Then we have the following two useful lemmas.

Similar to the proof of Lemma 4.1 in [21], applying classical results in the theory of ordinary differential equations, one can obtain the following result on q which is crucial in the proof of blow-up scenarios.

Lemma 3.3 *Let* $u \in C([0,T);H^s)\bigcap C^1([0,T);H^{s-1}), s \geq 2$. *Then Eq.(3.7) has a unique solution* $q \in C^1([0,T)\times\mathbb{R};\mathbb{R})$. *Moreover, the map* $q(t,\cdot)$ *is an increasing diffeomorphism of* $\mathbb{R}$ *with*

$$q_x(t,x) = exp\left(-\int_0^t u_x(s,-q(s,x))ds\right) > 0, \quad (t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}.$$

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^s \times H^{s-1}$, $s \geq 2$ *and let* $T>0$ *be the maximal existence time of the corresponding solution* $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ *to (1.2). Then we have*

$$\rho(t,-q(t,x))q_x(t,x) = \rho_0(-x), \quad \forall\ (t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{S}. \tag{3.8}$$

Moreover, if there exists $M>0$ *such that* $u_x \leq M$ *for all* $(t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{S}$, *then*

$$\|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \leq e^{MT}\|\rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall\ t\in[0,T).$$

Proof Differentiating the left-hand side of the equation (3.8) with respect to t, and applying the relations (2.4) and (3.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\rho(t,-q(t,x))q_x(t,x)\\
=&(\rho_t(t,-q) - \rho_x(t,-q)q_t(t,x))q_x(t,x) + \rho(t,-q(t,x))q_{xt}(t,x)\\
=&(\rho_t - (u(t,-q)+2\gamma_2)\rho_x)q_x(t,x) - u_x\rho q_x(t,x)\\
=&(\rho_t - (u+2\gamma_2)\rho_x - u_x\rho)q_x(t,x) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

This proves (3.8). By Lemma 3.3, in view of (3.8) and the assumption of the lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S})} &= \|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\\
&= \|\rho(t,-q(t,\cdot))\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\\
&= \|exp\left(\int_0^t u_x(s,-q(s,x))ds\right)\rho_0(-x)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}\\
&\leq e^{MT}\|\rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = e^{MT}\|\rho_0(\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S})}, \quad \forall\ t\in[0,T).
\end{aligned}$$

Our next result describes the precise blow-up scenario for sufficiently regular solutions to (1.2).

Theorem 3.2 *Let* $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^s\times H^{s-1}$, $s > \frac{5}{2}$ *be given and let* T *be the maximal existence time of the corresponding solution* $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ *to (2.4) with the initial data* z_0. *Then the corresponding solution blows up in finite time if and only if*

$$\limsup_{t\to T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{S}}\{u_x(t,x)\} = +\infty \quad or \quad \limsup_{t\to T}\{\|\rho_x(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}\} = +\infty.$$

Proof By Theorem 2.1 and Sobolev's imbedding theorem it is clear that if

$$\limsup_{t\to T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{S}}\{u_x(t,x)\} = +\infty \quad \text{or} \quad \limsup_{t\to T}\{\|\rho_x(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}\} = +\infty,$$

then $T<\infty$.

Let $T<\infty$. Assume that there exists $M_1>0$ and $M_2>0$ such that

$$u_x(t,x)\le M_1, \quad \forall\ (t,x)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{S},$$

and

$$\|\rho_x(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}\le M_2, \quad \forall\ t\in[0,T).$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty}\le e^{M_1T}\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall\ t\in[0,T).$$

By (2.2) and the first equation in (2.4), a direct computation implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}}u^2(t,x)dx \\
={}& 2\int_{\mathbb{S}}u\left((u+\gamma_1)u_x+\partial_x^{-1}(-2\mu_0u-\frac{1}{2}u_x^2-\frac{1}{2}\rho^2+a)+h(t)\right)dx \\
\le{}& \int_{\mathbb{S}}u^2dx+\int_{\mathbb{S}}\left(\int_0^x(-2\mu_0u-\frac{1}{2}u_y^2-\frac{1}{2}\rho^2+a)dy\right)^2dx+2|h(t)|\int_{\mathbb{S}}|u(t,x)|dx \\
\le{}& \int_{\mathbb{S}}u^2dx+8\mu_0^2(\int_{\mathbb{S}}|u|dx)^2+2\left(\int_{\mathbb{S}}(\frac{1}{2}u_x^2+\frac{1}{2}\rho^2+a)dx\right)^2 \\
&+\max_{t\in[0,T)}|h(t)|+\max_{t\in[0,T)}|h(t)|\int_{\mathbb{S}}u^2(t,x)dx \\
={}& (1+8\mu_0^2+\max_{t\in[0,T)}|h(t)|)\int_{\mathbb{S}}u^2dx+\frac{1}{2}\left[\int_0^1(u_{0,x}^2+\rho_0^2+2a)dx\right]^2+\max_{t\in[0,T)}|h(t)|
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

for $t\in(0,T)$.

Multiplying the first equation in (1.2) by $m=u_{xx}$ and integrating by parts, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}}m^2dx ={}& -4\mu\int_{\mathbb{S}}mu_xdx+4\int_{\mathbb{S}}u_xm^2dx+2\int_{\mathbb{S}}umm_xdx \\
&-2\int_{\mathbb{S}}m\rho\rho_xdx+2\gamma_1\int_{\mathbb{S}}mm_xdx \\
={}& 3\int_{\mathbb{S}}u_xm^2dx-2\int_{\mathbb{S}}m\rho\rho_xdx \\
\le{}& 3M_1\int_{\mathbb{S}}m^2dx+\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}}m^2+\rho_x^2dx \\
\le{}& (3M_1+\|\rho\|_{L^\infty})\int_{\mathbb{S}}m^2dx+\|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}}\rho_x^2dx.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Differentiating the first equation in (1.2) with respect to x, multiplying the obtained equation by $m_x = u_{xxx}$, integrating by parts and using Lemma 3.4, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x^2 dx \qquad (3.11)\\
=\ & -4\mu\int_{\mathbb{S}} mm_x + 4\int_{\mathbb{S}} m^2 m_x dx + 6\int_{\mathbb{S}} u_x m_x^2 + 2\int_{\mathbb{S}} u m_{xx} m_x\\
& -2\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_x^2 m_x - 2\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho\rho_{xx} m_x dx + 2\gamma_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x m_{xx} dx\\
=\ & 5\int_{\mathbb{S}} u_x m_x^2 dx - 2\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_x^2 m_x dx - 2\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho\rho_{xx} m_x dx\\
\le\ & 5M_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x^2 dx + 2\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2\int_{\mathbb{S}} |m_x| dx + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} (\rho_{xx}^2 + m_x^2) dx\\
\le\ & 5M_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x^2 dx + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} (\rho_{xx}^2 + m_x^2) dx + 2\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2 + 2\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x^2 dx\\
\le\ & (5M_1 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty} + 2M_2^2)\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x^2 dx + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_{xx}^2 dx + 2M_2^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Differentiating the second equation in (1.2) with respect to x, multiplying the obtained equation by ρ_x and integrating by parts, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_x^2 dx &= 3\int_{\mathbb{S}} u_x \rho_x^2 dx + 2\int_{\mathbb{S}} m\rho\rho_x dx \qquad (3.12)\\
&\le 3M_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_x^2 dx + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} (m^2 + \rho_x^2) dx\\
&= (3M_1 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty})\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_x^2 dx + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} m^2 dx.
\end{aligned}
$$

Differentiating the second equation in (1.2) with respect to x twice, multiplying the obtained equation by ρ_{xx}, integrating by parts and using Lemma 3.4, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_{xx}^2 dx \qquad (3.13)\\
=\ & 5\int_{\mathbb{S}} u_x \rho_{xx}^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}} u_{xxx}(2\rho\rho_{xx} - 3\rho_x^2) dx\\
\le\ & 5M_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_{xx}^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x(2\rho\rho_{xx} - 3\rho_x^2) dx\\
\le\ & 5M_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_{xx}^2 dx + 3\|\rho_x\|_{L^\infty}^2\int_{\mathbb{S}} |m_x| dx + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{S}} 2m_x\rho_{xx} dx\\
\le\ & (5M_1 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty})\int_{\mathbb{S}} \rho_{xx}^2 dx + (3M_2^2 + \|\rho\|_{L^\infty})\int_{\mathbb{S}} m_x^2 dx + 3M_2^2.
\end{aligned}
$$

Summing (2.2) and (3.9)-(3.13), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}} (u^2 + u_x^2 + m^2 + m_x^2 + \rho^2 + \rho_x^2 + \rho_{xx}^2) dx\\
\le\ & K_1\int_{\mathbb{S}} (u^2 + u_x^2 + m^2 + m_x^2 + \rho^2 + \rho_x^2 + \rho_{xx}^2) dx + K_2,
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$K_1 = 1 + 8\mu_0^2 + \max_{t\in[0,T)} |h(t)| + 8e^{M_1 T}\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty} + 16M_1 + 5M_2^2,$$

$$K_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[\int_{\mathbb{S}} (u_{0,x}^2 + \rho_0^2 + 2a)dx\right]^2 + \max_{t\in[0,T)} |h(t)| + 5M_2^2.$$

By means of Gronwall's inequality and the above inequality, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|u(t,\cdot)\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 \\ &\le e^{K_1 t}(\|u_0\|_{H^3}^2 + \|\rho_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \frac{K_2}{K_1}), \quad \forall\ t \in [0,T). \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality, Sobolev's imbedding theorem and Theorem 3.1 ensure that the solution z does not blow-up in finite time. This completes the proof of the theorem.

For initial data $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^2 \times H^1$, we have the following precise blow-up scenario.

Theorem 3.3 *Let* $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^2 \times H^1$, *and let* T *be the maximal existence time of the corresponding solution* $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ *to (2.4) with the initial data* z_0. *Then the corresponding solution blows up in finite time if and only if*

$$\limsup_{t\to T} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{S}} \{u_x(t,x)\} = +\infty.$$

Proof Let $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ be the solution to (2.4) with the initial data $z_0 \in H^2 \times H^1$, and let T be the maximal existence time of the solution z, which is guaranteed by Theorem 2.1.

Let $T < \infty$. Assume that there exists $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$u_x(t,x) \le M_1, \quad \forall\ (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{S}.$$

By Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty} \le e^{M_1 T}\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty}, \quad \forall\ t \in [0,T).$$

Combining (2.2), (3.9)-(3.10) and (3.12), we obtain

$$\frac{d}{dt}\int_{\mathbb{S}} (u^2 + u_x^2 + m^2 + \rho^2 + \rho_x^2)dx \le K_3 \int_{\mathbb{S}} (u^2 + u_x^2 + m^2 + \rho^2 + \rho_x^2)dx + K_4,$$

where

$$K_3 = 1 + 8\mu_0^2 + \max_{t\in[0,T)} |h(t)| + 6M_1 + 4e^{M_1 T}\|\rho_0\|_{L^\infty},$$

$$K_4 = \frac{1}{2}\left[\int_0^1 (u_{0,x}^2 + \rho_0^2 + 2a)dx\right]^2 + \max_{t\in[0,T)} |h(t)|.$$

By means of Gronwall's inequality and the above inequality, we get

$$\|u(t,\cdot)\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\rho(t,\cdot)\|_{H^1}^2 \le e^{K_3 t}(\|u_0\|_{H^2}^2 + \|\rho_0\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{K_4}{K_3}).$$

The above inequality ensures that the solution z does not blow-up in finite time.

On the other hand, by Sobolev's imbedding theorem, we see that if

$$\limsup_{t\to T} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{S}}\{u_x(t,x)\} = +\infty,$$

then the solution will blow up in finite time. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remark 3.1 *Note that Theorem 3.2 shows that*

$$T(\|z_0\|_{H^s\times H^{s-1}}) = T(\|z_0\|_{H^{s'}\times H^{s'-1}}), \qquad \forall s, s' > \frac{5}{2},$$

while Theorem 3.3 implies that

$$T(\|z_0\|_{H^s\times H^{s-1}}) \le T(\|z_0\|_{H^2\times H^1}), \qquad \forall s, s' \ge 2.$$

4 Blow-up

In this section, we discuss the blow-up phenomena of the system (1.2) and prove that there exist strong solutions to (1.2) which do not exist globally in time.

Lemma 4.1 *([3, 10])If $f \in H^1(\mathbb{S})$ is such that $\int_{\mathbb{S}} f(x)dx = 0$, then we have*

$$\max_{x\in\mathbb{S}} f^2(x) \le \frac{1}{12}\int_{\mathbb{S}} f_x^2(x)dx.$$

Note that $\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u(t,x)-\mu_0)dx = \mu_0 - \mu_0 = 0$. By Lemma 4.1, we find that

$$\max_{x\in\mathbb{S}}[u(t,x)-\mu_0]^2 \le \frac{1}{12}\int_{\mathbb{S}} u_x^2(t,x)dx \le \frac{1}{12}\mu_1^2.$$

So we have

$$\|u(t,\cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{S})} \le |\mu_0| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}\mu_1. \tag{4.1}$$

Theorem 4.1 *Let $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \not\equiv 0 \in H^s \times H^{s-1}, s \ge 2$, and T be the maximal time of the solution $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ to (1.2) with the initial data z_0. If $\gamma_1 = 2\gamma_2$, $\mu_0 = 0$ and there exists a point $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}$, such that $\rho_0(-x_0) = 0$, then the corresponding solution to (1.2) blows up in finite time.*

Proof Let $m(t) = u_x(t, -q(t, x_0))$, $\gamma(t) = \rho(t, -q(t, x_0))$, where $q(t, x)$ is the solution of Eq.(3.7). By Eq.(3.7) we can obtain

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = (u_{tx} - (u + \gamma_1)u_{xx})(t, -q(t, x_0)).$$

Evaluating the integrated representation (2.3) at $(t, -q(t, x_0))$ with the assumption $\mu_0 = 0$, we get

$$\frac{d}{dt}m(t) = \frac{1}{2}m(t)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma(t)^2 + a.$$

Since $\gamma(0) = 0$, we infer from Lemmas 3.3-3.4 that $\gamma(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T)$. Note that $a = 2\mu(u)^2 + \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{S}}(u_x^2 + \rho^2)dx > 0$. (Indeed, if $a(t) = 0$, then $(u, \rho) = (0, 0)$. This contradicts the assumption of the theorem.) Then we have $\frac{d}{dt}m(t) \geq a > 0$. Thus, it follows that $m(t_0) > 0$ for some $t_0 \in (0, T)$. Solving the following inequality yields

$$\frac{d}{dt}m(t) \geq \frac{1}{2}m(t)^2.$$

Therefore

$$0 < \frac{1}{m(t)} \leq \frac{1}{m(t_0)} - \frac{1}{2}(t - t_0), \qquad t \in [t_0, T).$$

The above inequality implies that $T < t_0 + \frac{2}{m(t_0)}$ and $\lim_{t \to T} m(t) = +\infty$. In view of Theorem 3.2, this completes the proof of the theorem.

Theorem 4.2 *Let* $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^s \times H^{s-1}, s \geq 2,$ *and* T *be the maximal time of the solution* $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ *to (1.2) with the initial data* z_0. *If* $\gamma_1 = 2\gamma_2$, $\mu_0 \neq 0$, $|\mu_0| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}\mu_1 < \frac{a}{2|\mu_0|}$ *and there exists a point* $x_0 \in \mathbb{S}$, *such that* $\rho_0(-x_0) = 0$, *then the corresponding solution to (1.2) blows up in finite time.*

Proof Let $m(t) = u_x(t, -q(t, x_0))$, $\gamma(t) = \rho(t, -q(t, x_0))$, where $q(t, x)$ is the solution of Eq.(3.7). By Eq.(3.7) we can obtain

$$\frac{dm}{dt} = (u_{tx} - (u + \gamma_1)u_{xx})(t, -q(t, x_0)).$$

Evaluating the integrated representation (2.3) at $(t, -q(t, x_0))$ we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}m(t) = \frac{1}{2}m(t)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\gamma(t)^2 + a - 2\mu_0 u.$$

Since $\gamma(0) = 0$, we infer from Lemmas 3.3-3.4 that $\gamma(t) = 0$ for all $t \in [0, T)$. In view of (4.1) and the condition $|\mu_0| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}\mu_1 < \frac{a}{2|\mu_0|}$, we have $a - 2\mu_0 u \geq a - 2|\mu_0 u| > 0$. Then we have $\frac{d}{dt}m(t) \geq a - 2\mu_0 u > 0$. The left proof is the same as that of Theorem 4.1, so we omit it here.

5 Global Existence

In this section, we will present a global existence result. Firstly, we give two useful lemmas.

Theorem 5.1 *Let* $z_0 = \begin{pmatrix} u_0 \\ \rho_0 \end{pmatrix} \in H^2 \times H^1$, *and* T *be the maximal time of the solution* $z = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ \rho \end{pmatrix}$ *to (1.2) with the initial data* z_0. *If* $\gamma_1 = 2\gamma_2$, $\rho_0(x) \neq 0$ *for all* $x \in \mathbb{S}$, *then the corresponding solution* z *exists globally in time.*

Proof By Lemma 3.3, we know that $q(t, \cdot)$ is an increasing diffeomorphism of $\mathbb{R}$ with

$$q_x(t,x) = exp\left(- \int_0^t u_x(s, -q(s,x))ds \right) > 0, \quad \forall \ (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Moreover,

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{S}} u_y(t,y) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} u_x(t, -q(t,x)), \ \forall \ t \in [0,T). \tag{5.1}$$

Set $M(t,x) = u_x(t, -q(t,x))$ and $\alpha(t,x) = \rho(t, -q(t,x))$ for $t \in [0,T)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$. By $\gamma_1 = 2\gamma_2$, (1.2) and Eq.(3.7), we have

$$\frac{\partial M}{\partial t} = (u_{tx} - (u + \gamma_1)u_{xx})(t, -q(t,x)) \ \text{ and } \ \frac{\partial \alpha}{\partial t} = \alpha M. \tag{5.2}$$

Evaluating (2.3) at $(t, -q(t,x))$ we get

$$\partial_t M(t,x) = \frac{1}{2} M(t,x)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha(t,x)^2 + a - 2\mu_0 u(t, -q(t,x)).$$

Write $f(t,x) = a - 2\mu_0 u(t, -q(t,x))$. By (4.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(t,x)| \leq a + 2|\mu_0| \|u\|_{L^\infty} &\leq a + 2|\mu_0|(|\mu_0| + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{6}\mu_1) \\ &= 4\mu_0^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}|\mu_0|\mu_1 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\partial_t M(t,x) = \frac{1}{2} M(t,x)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha(t,x)^2 + f(t,x). \tag{5.3}$$

By Lemmas 3.3-3.4, we know that $\alpha(t,x)$ has the same sign with $\alpha(0,x) = \rho_0(-x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, there is a constant $\beta > 0$ such that $\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\alpha(0,x)| = \inf_{x \in \mathbb{S}} |\rho_0(-x)| \geq \beta > 0$ since $\rho_0(x) \neq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{S}$ and $\mathbb{S}$ is a compact set. Thus,

$$\alpha(t,x)\alpha(0,x) > 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Next, we consider the following Lyapunov function first introduced in [4].

$$w(t,x) = \alpha(t,x)\alpha(0,x) + \frac{\alpha(0,x)}{\alpha(t,x)}(1 + M^2), \quad (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.4}$$

By Sobolev's imbedding theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < w(0,x) &= \alpha(0,x)^2 + 1 + M(0,x)^2 \\ &= \rho_0(x)^2 + 1 + u_{0,x}(x)^2 \\ &\le 1 + \max_{x\in\mathbb{S}}(\rho_0(x)^2 + u_{0,x}(x)^2) := C_1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Differentiating (5.4) with respect to t and using (5.2)-(5.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial w}{\partial t}(t,x) &= \frac{\alpha(0,x)}{\alpha(t,x)}M(t,x)(2f-1) \\ &\le |f-\frac{1}{2}|\frac{\alpha(0,x)}{\alpha(t,x)}(1+M^2) \\ &\le (4\mu_0^2 + \frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}|\mu_0|\mu_1 + \frac{1}{2})w(t,x). \end{aligned}$$

By Gronwall's inequality, the above inequality and (5.5), we have

$$w(t,x) \le w(0,x)e^{(4\mu_0^2+\frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}|\mu_0|\mu_1+\frac{1}{2})t} \le C_1 e^{(4\mu_0^2+\frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}|\mu_0|\mu_1+\frac{1}{2})t}$$

for all $(t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand,

$$w(t,x) \ge 2\sqrt{\alpha^2(0,x)(1+M^2)} \ge 2\beta|M(t,x)|, \quad \forall \ \ (t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Thus,

$$|M(t,x)| \le \frac{1}{2\beta}w(t,x) \le \frac{1}{2\beta}C_1 e^{(4\mu_0^2+\frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}|\mu_0|\mu_1+\frac{1}{2})t}$$

for all $(t,x) \in [0,T) \times \mathbb{R}$. Then by (5.1) and the above inequality, we have

$$\limsup_{t\to T}\sup_{y\in\mathbb{S}} u_y(t,y) = \limsup_{t\to T}\sup_{x\in\mathbb{R}} u_x(t,-q(t,x)) \le \frac{1}{2\beta}C_1 e^{(4\mu_0^2+\frac{1}{2}\mu_1^2+\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}|\mu_0|\mu_1+\frac{1}{2})t}.$$

This completes the proof by using Theorem 3.3.

Acknowledgments This work was partially supported by NNSFC (No. 10971235), RFDP (No. 200805580014), NCET-08-0579 and the key project of Sun Yat-sen University.

References

[1] R. Beals, D. Sattinger and J. Szmigielski, Inverse scattering solutions of the Hunter-Saxton equations, *Appl. Anal.*, **78** (2001), 255-269.

[2] R. Camassa and D. Holm, An integrable shallow water equation with peaked solitons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **71** (1993), 1661-1664.

[3] A. Constantin, On the Blow-up of solutions of a periodic shallow water equation, *J. Nonlinear Sci.*, **10** (2000), 391-399.

[4] A. Constantin and R. I. Ivanov, On an integrable two-component Camass-Holm shallow water system, *Phys. Lett. A*, **372** (2008), 7129–7132.

[5] A. Constantin and B. Kolev, On the geometric approach to the motion of inertial mechanical systems, *J. Phys. A*, **35** (2002), R51-R79.

[6] A. Constantin and H. P. McKean, A shallow water equation on the circle, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **52** (1999), 949-982.

[7] H. H. Dai and M. Pavlov, Transformations for the Camassa-Holm equation, its high-frequency limit and the Sinh-Gordon equation, *J. P. Soc. Japan*, **67** (1998), 3655-3657.

[8] J. Escher, O. Lechtenfeld and Z. Yin, Well-posedness and blow-up phenomena for the 2-component Camassa-Holm equation, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.*, **19** (2007), 493-513.

[9] A. Fokas and B. Fuchssteiner, Symplectic structures, their Backlund transformations and hereditary symmetries, *Phys. D*, **4** (1981/1982), 47-66.

[10] Y. Fu, Y. Liu and C. Qu, On the blow up structure for the generalized periodic Camassa-Holm and Degasperis-Procesi equations, arXiv:1009.2466.

[11] J. K. Hunter and R. Saxton, Dynamics of director fields, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.*, **51** (1991), 1498-1521.

[12] J. K. Hunter and Y. Zheng, On a completely integrable nonlinear hyperbolic variational equation, *Phys. D*, **79** (1994), 361-386.

[13] R. S. Johnson, Camassa-Holm, Korteweg-de Vries and related models for water waves, *J. Fluid. Mech.*, **455** (2002), 63-82.

[14] T. Kato, Quasi-linear equations of evolution, with applications to partial differential equations, in "Spectral Theory and Differential Equations", Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 448, Springer Verlag, Berlin, (1975), 25–70.

[15] T. Kato and G. Ponce, Commutator estimates and Navier-Stokes equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **41** (1988), 203–208.

[16] B. Khesin, J. Lenells and G. Misiolek, Generalized Hunter-Saxton equation and the geometry of the group of circle diffeomorphisms, *Math. Ann.*, **342** (2008), 617-656.

[17] J. Lenells, G. Misiolek and F. Tiğlay, Integrable evolution equations on spaces of tensor densities and their peakon solutions, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, **299** (2010), 129-161.

[18] J. Liu and Z. Yin, Blow-up phenomena and global existence for a periodic two-component Hunter-Saxton system, arXiv:1012.5448.

[19] P. Olver and P. Rosenau, Tri-Hamiltonian duality between solitons and solitary wave solutions having compact support, *Phys. Rev. E(3)*, **53** (1996), 1900-1906.

[20] M. Wunsch, On the Hunter-Saxton system, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. B*, **12** (2009), 647-656.

[21] Z. Yin, Global existence for a new periodic integrable equation, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, **283**, (2003), 129-139.

[22] Z. Yin, On the structure of solutions to the periodic Hunter-Saxton equation, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **36** (2004), 272-283.

[23] D. Zuo, A 2-component μ-Hunter-Saxton Equation, *Inverse Problems*, **26** (2010), 085003 (9pp).